APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,798	12/28/2000	Thomas E. Donaldson	06975-146001/ Search2	6269

7590   10/23/2002

JOHN F. HAYDEN
Fish & Richardson P.C.
601 Thirteenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, CINDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2171	

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/749,798		DONALDSON ET AL.	
	Examiner		**Art Unit**	
	Cindy Nguyen		2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _28 December 2000_ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-21_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-21_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _28 December 2000_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

   If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

   a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _4 and 6_ .   6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to application filed on December 28, 2000 in which claims 1-21 are presented

for examination.

1.   *Information Disclosure Statement*

The information disclosure statement filed on March 28, 2001 and June 26, 2001 are in

compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. Because they have

been placed in the application file, and the information referred to therein has been considered

as to the merits.

2.   *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis

for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United
> States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who
> has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention
> thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999

(AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined

was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C.

122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment

by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3.   Claims 1-3, 9, 12 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tso

et al. (U.S 6385602) (Tso).

Regarding claim 1, Tso disclose: A method for searching different data stores based on a

classification of a search term (col. 4, lines 16-30, Tso), the method comprising:

receiving at least one search term (104, fig. 1 and corresponding text, Tso);

classifying the search term among at least first and second categories (212, Fig. 2 and

corresponding text, Tso);

when the search term is classified within the first category (302, Fig. 3 and corresponding

text, Tso), comparing the search term to first electronic information within a first electronic

information store (col. 10, lines 50-52, Tso) to determine whether matches exist (col. 5, lines 9-

12, Tso);

when the search term is classified within the second category (304, Fig. 3 and

corresponding text, Tso), comparing the search term to at least second electronic information

within at least a second electronic information store (col. 10, lines 55-58, Tso) that differs from

the first electronic information store to determine whether matches exist (col. 9, lines 35-46,

Tso); and

displaying a result based on the matches that are determined to exist (222, fig. 2 and

corresponding text, Tso).

Regarding claim 2, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

claim 1. In addition, Tso disclose: wherein comparing the search term when the search term is

classified within the second category comprises comparing the search term to the first electronic

information within the first electronic information store and to the second electronic information

within the second electronic information store (col. 9, lines 55-66, Tso).

Regarding claim 3, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

claim 1. In addition, Tso disclose: wherein: receiving at least one search term comprises

receiving several search terms (204, fig. 2 and corresponding text, Tso) and grouping the search

terms received as a single string (216, fig. 2 and corresponding text, Tso);

classifying the search term comprises classifying the single string of search terms among

at least first and second categories (212, fig. 2 and corresponding text, Tso);

comparing the search term when the single string of search terms is classified within the

first category comprises comparing the single string of search terms to the first electronic

information within the first electronic information store to determine whether matches exist (col.

4, lines 16-19, Tso); and

comparing the search term when the single string of search terms is classified within the

second category comprises comparing the single string of search terms to the second electronic

information within the second electronic information store to determine whether matches exist

(col. 6, lines 1-12, Tso).

Regarding claim 9, Tso disclose: A method of storing searchable contents into more than

one distinct data store (col. 4, lines 16-30, Tso), the method comprising: receiving content (104,

fig. 1 and corresponding text, Tso);

classifying the content among a first electronic information store and a second electronic

information store (col. 5, lines 43-47, Tso); and

storing the content based on the classifying among the first electronic information store

and the second electronic information store (col. 10, lines 50-58, Tso).

Regarding claim 12, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

claim 9. In addition, Tso disclose: wherein the first electronic information store includes

non-offensive content (col. 10, lines 49-52, Tso).

Regarding claim 16, Tso disclose: A computer program, stored on a computer readable

medium (410, fig. 4 and corresponding text, Tso), for searching different data stores based on a

classification of a search term (col. 4, lines 16-30, Tso), comprising instructions for: receiving at

least one search term(104, fig. 1 and corresponding text, Tso);

classifying the search term among at least first and second categories (212, Fig. 2 and

corresponding text, Tso);

when the search term is classified within the first category , comparing the search term to

first electronic information within a first electronic information store (col. 10, lines 50-52, Tso)

to determine whether matches exist (col. 5, lines 9-12, Tso);

when the search term is classified within the second category (304, Fig. 3 and

corresponding text, Tso), comparing the search term to at least second electronic information

within at least a second electronic information store that differs from the first electronic

information store (col. 10, lines 55-58, Tso) to determine whether matches exist (col. 9, lines 35-46, Tso); and

displaying a result based on the matches that are determined to exist (222, fig. 2 and corresponding text, Tso).

Regarding claim 19, Tso disclose: A computer program, stored on a computer readable medium (410, fig. 4 and corresponding text, Tso), for storing searchable contents into more than one distinct data store (col. 4, lines 16-30, Tso), comprising instructions for: receiving content (104, fig. 1 and corresponding text, Tso);

classifying content among a first electronic information store and a second electronic information store (col. 5, lines 43-47, Tso); and storing the content based on the classifying among the first electronic information store and the second electronic information store (col. 10, lines 50-58, Tso).

Regarding claims 17 and 20, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 16 and 19, respectively. In addition, Tso disclose: wherein the computer readable medium comprises a propagated signal (col. 11, lines 47-62, Tso).

Regarding claims 18 and 21, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 17 and 20, respectively. In addition, Tso disclose: wherein the propagated signal comprises a carrier wave (col. 11, lines 47-62, Tso).

4.   **Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Belfiore et al. (U.S 6038610) (Belfiore).**

Regarding claim 14, Belfiore disclose: A system for storing searchable content, comprising: a first electronic information store that includes content based on classifying the content as non-offensive; and a second electronic information store that includes content based on classifying the content as offensive (col. 2, lines 59-65, Belfiore).

Regarding claim 15, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 14. In addition, Belfiore disclose: wherein the first electronic information store is included on a first server and the second electronic information store is included on a second server that differs from the first server (col. 2, lines 66 to col. 3, lines 11, Belfiore).

5.   *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   **Claims 4-8, 10, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al. (U.S 6385602) (Tso) in view of Belfiore et al. (U.S 6038610) (Belfiore).**

Regarding claim 4, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Tso disclose: wherein the first electronic information includes contents relating to non-offensive web sites (col. 5, lines 39-47). However, Tso didn't disclose: the second

electronic information includes contents relating to offensive web sites. On the other hand,

Belfiore disclose: the second electronic information includes contents relating to offensive web

sites (col. 2, lines 59-65, Belfiore). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the offensive web sites in the system of

Tso as taught by Belfiore. The motivation being to screen for offensive materials from web sites.

Regarding claim 5, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

claim 1. In addition, Tso/Belfiore disclose: wherein the method is performed by a web host

having members (424, fig. 4 and corresponding text, Tso) and the method further comprises:

automatically scanning contents of a web site when the web site is accessed by

members of the web host (col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 8, Tso);

classifying the contents of the web site among at least one of the first electronic

information within the first electronic information store and the second electronic information

within the second electronic information store(col. 9, lines 55-66, Tso);

storing the contents of the web site in the first electronic information within the first

electronic information store when the contents of the web site are classified among the first

electronic information (col. 12, lines 18-24, Belfiore); and

storing the contents of the web site in the second electronic information within the second

electronic information store when the contents of the web site are classified among the second

electronic information (col. 12, lines 25-46, Belfiore). Thus, at the time invention was made, it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the step of storing the

contents of the web site in the system of Tso as taught by Belfiore. The motivation being to

enable users to store the classified information in separate database for managing data in

storages.

Regarding claims 6, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

claim 5. In addition, Tso/Belfiore disclose: wherein the first electronic information store is

located on a first server and the second electronic information store is located on a second server

that differs from the first server (col. 2, lines 66 to col. 3, lines 11, Belfiore).

Regarding claim 7, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

claim 1. In addition, Tso/Belfiore disclose: wherein the first electronic information includes full

text, titles, descriptions, and addresses of web sites such that the comparing the search term to

the first electronic information within the first electronic information store comprises comparing

the search term to the full text, the titles, the descriptions, and the addresses of web sites to

determine whether matches exist (col. 4, lines 58 to col. 5, lines 23, Belfiore). Thus, at the time

invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include

the step of comparing the search term to the full text, the titles, the descriptions, and the

addresses of web sites to determine whether matches exist in the system of Tso as taught by

Belfiore. The motivation being to enable users to choose the most relevant hits without the loss

of information.

Regarding claim 8, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In

addition, Tso/Belfiore disclose: wherein the second electronic information includes full text, titles,

descriptions, and addresses of web sites such that the comparing the search term to the second electronic

information within the second electronic information store comprise comparing the search term to the

full text, the titles, the descriptions, and the addresses of web sites to determine whether matches exist

(col. 4, lines 58 to col. 5, lines 23, Belfiore).

Regarding claim 10, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

claim 9. In addition, Tso/Belfiore disclose: wherein the classifying is based on content received

from a listing service (col. 11, lines 41-59, Belfiore). Thus, at the time invention was made, it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the step of received

the classification from a listing service in the system of Tso as taught by Belfiore. The

motivation being to provide clues to users on whether or not they wish to access certain web

pages.

Regarding claim 11, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

claim 9. In addition, Tso/Belfiore disclose: wherein the classifying is based on the content itself

(col. 12, lines 19-25, Belfiore). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the classifying is based on the content

itself in the system of Tso as taught by Belfiore. The motivation being to provide clues to users

on whether or not they wish to access certain web pages.

Regarding claim 13, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

claim 12. In addition, Tso/Belfiore disclose: wherein the second electronic information store

includes offensive content (col. 2, lines 59-65, Belfiore).

7. *Contact Information*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-4698. The examiner can

normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet

Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7240

for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should

be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CN

Cindy Nguyen

October 21, 2002

UYEN LE

AU 2171